

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
10                  AT SEATTLE

11                  ETHAN RADSTONE,

12                  v.  
13                  Plaintiff,

14                  GARRISON PROPERTY AND  
15                  CASUALTY INSURANCE  
16                  COMPANY,

17                  Defendant.

18                  CASE NO. C24-1588 MJP

19                  ORDER DENYING JOINT  
20                  MOTION TO EXTEND  
21                  DISCOVERY

22                  This matter comes before the Court on the Parties' Joint Motion to Extend Deadline for  
23                  Discovery. (Dkt. No. 11.) Having reviewed the Motion and all supporting materials, the Court  
24                  DENIES the Motion.

25                  Rule 16(b)(4) states that "a schedule may be modified only for good cause and with the  
26                  judge's consent." Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4). "Rule 16(b)'s 'good cause' standard primarily  
27                  considers the diligence of the party seeking the amendment." Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations,  
28                  Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). "[T]he focus of the inquiry is upon the moving party's

1 reasons for seeking modification” and “[i]f that party was not diligent, the inquiry should end.”  
2 Id. (citation omitted).

3 The Parties here have failed to demonstrate good cause to support their request of nearly  
4 every case deadline except trial by 90 days. Absent is any reasonable explanation as to why  
5 discovery cannot be completed before the July 30, 2025 deadline. The Parties reference “the  
6 process of coordinating several depositions and . . . how to proceed with expert discovery.” (Mot.  
7 at 2.) But they do not identify how many depositions need to be conducted, why they have not  
8 been set, and why they cannot be completed before July 30th. Additionally, there is no  
9 explanation as to what expert discovery needs to be conducted and why it cannot be completed  
10 before the expert disclosure deadline of June 30, 2025. And to the extent the Parties wish to  
11 engaged in settlement negotiations, they are free to do so at any time. The Court will not amend  
12 the case schedule for alternative dispute resolution.

13 Even if the Parties had demonstrated good cause, their proposed case schedule is not  
14 tenable. They propose a dispositive motion deadline of December 28, 2025, which would mean  
15 that the motions would ripen for decision after trial commences. The Court requires at least three  
16 months between the dispositive motion noting date and trial. Should the Parties renew their  
17 request for an extension, they must propose a reasonable schedule that allows adequate time for  
18 determinations on motions before trial.

19 For the reasons noted above, the Court DENIES the Motion. The Court’s denial is  
20 without prejudice to a renewed motion that addresses the Court’s concerns.

21 \\

22 \\

23 \\

1 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

2 Dated May 27, 2025.

3 

4 Marsha J. Pechman  
United States Senior District Judge

5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24